

RYAN, PHILLIPS, UTRECHT & MACKINNON *

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
* Nonlawyer Partner

1133 Connecticut Avenue, N W

Suite 300

Washington, D C 20036

(202) 293-1177

Facsimile (202) 293-3411

May 30, 2008

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

2008 MAY 30 P 4 25

RECEIVED
FEC MAIL CENTER
2008 MAY 30 PM 3 24

Thomasena P Duncan
General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20463

Re MUR 5995, Senator Hillary Clinton, Hillary Clinton for President and Shelly Moskwa, as Treasurer

Dear Ms Duncan

This is the response of our clients, Senator Hillary Clinton, Hillary Clinton for President and Shelly Moskwa, as Treasurer (collectively, the "Committee" or "Respondents") to the complaint filed in Matter Under Review ("MUR") 5995. In short, the complaint which is nearly identical to the complaint filed in MUR 5987 – and to which the Committee previously responded – is directly contrary to years of clear Commission precedent and wholly fails to recite any facts that would constitute a violation of the law. For the reasons stated below, Respondents respectfully request that the Commission find no reason to believe that any violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (the "Act"), as amended, or the Commission regulations has occurred, dismiss this complaint, and close this MUR as expeditiously as possible.

I. Background

At issue in this MUR, as with MUR 5987, is a fundraising event organized by the Committee. The entertainment at the fundraiser consisted of a concert performed by renowned musician Elton John. The fundraiser was held on April 9, 2008 at Radio City Music Hall in New York, New York. The program consisted of remarks by Committee representatives and the candidate followed by the concert.

The subject matter of this complaint is identical to the complaint filed in another recent MUR, 5987. The Committee responded to the complaint in that Matter on May 16, 2008 and fully incorporates its response herein to the complaint in this MUR, and the information and

discussion provided there should be considered in response to this complaint as well. A copy of the Committee's prior response is attached hereto, as *Exhibit A*.

Like the complaint in MUR 5987, Complainant relies on a misleading and erroneous column in the *Washington Times*, which questioned Elton John's participation in the concert, wrongfully cited an outdated Commission Advisory Opinion ("AO"), and completely misrepresented a statement by the Commission's own spokesperson, Bob Biersack, as well as his subsequent clarification regarding this event. As pointed out in the Committee's prior response, the *Times* declined to publish the clarification, resulting in a misleading public record, and despite the fact that the Committee made public the above-referenced clarification on the same day as the original erroneous column appeared, this Complainant, too, relied on the original misleading and incomplete column and filed the meritless complaint in this matter.¹

II. Discussion

- A. The law, including the Act, Commission regulations and AOs, clearly exempts the value of volunteer services by anyone, including a foreign national, from the definition of contribution and permits a foreign national to solicit support as part of those volunteer services.

Complainant alleges that Respondents may have accepted an in-kind contribution from a foreign national. As set out in the Committee's prior response and incorporated herein, the Act and Commission regulations provide that "[t]he term 'contribution' does not include the value of services provided without compensation by *any individual* who volunteers on behalf of a candidate or political committee." 2 U.S.C. §431(8)(B)(i). See also 11 CFR 100.74 (emphasis added). The term "any individual" has been interpreted by the Commission to include foreign nationals. Specifically, in AO 2004-26, the Commission concluded that a foreign national spouse of a candidate could participate in and perform campaign-related activities, including by speaking at campaign events or by soliciting funds and support for the campaign, because such uncompensated activities constituted exempt volunteer activity. See AO 2004-26 at 2.

Presumably to show an in-kind contribution, Complainant cites an email sent by Elton John, "through the Clinton campaign" announcing the concert and soliciting support.² The plain language of Complainant's own allegation fails to state a violation of law. A solicitation of support is permissible pursuant to AO 2004-26. The email was fully paid for by the Committee, as recognized by Complainant, and as demonstrated by the Committee's disclaimer thereon. A copy of the email is attached as *Exhibit B*.²

¹ Like the Complainant in the prior MUR, this Complainant was also fully aware of — but chose to disregard — the clarifying statement by Commission spokesperson Biersack, as it is included in the material attached by Complainant to the complaint. Complainant also disregarded an earlier statement by Biersack that appeared in *The Washington Post* that correctly set out the legal standard: "Elton John to Croon for Clinton," *The Washington Post*, March 17, 2008 (http://blog.washingtonpost.com/the-trail/2008/03/17/elton_john_to_croon_for_clinto_1.html).

² Complainant alleges no other solicitations by Elton John, and to the best of the Committee's knowledge, he did not engage in any.

Complainant also raises the issues of whether Elton John somehow participated in the Committee's decision-making process, in contravention of the foreign national prohibition. No facts are cited in support of this allegation, nor is any information or evidence provided. Complainant simply points to the same email mentioned above and infers some undefined and undescribed participation in the Committee's decision-making. Such an allegation is specious and is not borne out by the facts. Elton John did nothing other than to permit his name to be used in a Committee email. He had no role whatsoever in deciding when, where or how to send such an email. He had no role whatsoever in any decision-making process pertaining to the Committee's fundraising, other than the conditions under which he would volunteer his services by performing a concert. To suggest otherwise is unfounded and ludicrous and can serve no purpose other than to attempt to embarrass the Committee politically and Elton John professionally.

Commission regulations at 11 CFR 111.4(d)(3) require that all complaints – in order to be valid – “contain a clear and concise recitation of the facts *which describe a violation of a statute or regulation over which the Commission has jurisdiction*” (emphasis added). Complainant fails to meet this standard, and hence, the complaint should be dismissed forthwith. Complainant cites a single incomplete and misleading newspaper column and disregards the Commission's own clarification of the law. Complainant cites only a single fact of no legal import in its complaint, i.e., that the “Sir Elton John, through the Clinton campaign, sent out a mass email announcing the concert and soliciting support for Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign.” Given the clear language of the volunteer exemption and AO 2004-26, as described above, that fact alone does not describe a violation of either the Act or the Commission's regulations. Because it is indisputable that Complainant has failed to describe a violation of law, the complaint is invalid, for failing to meet the Commission's 111.4 requirements, and for this reason alone, the complaint should be dismissed.

B. Complainant selectively ignores press reports to misstate the law and misquotes the Commission's own spokesperson.

It bears repeating that Complainant – like the Complainant in MUR 5987 – relies on a misleading newspaper column that included a misquote of the Commission's own spokesperson. As originally appearing in the *Washington Times*, the column seemingly raised questions about the legality of Elton John volunteering his services by means of a concert and seemed to bolster that question with a quote from Bob Biersack. Although clarified by Biersack (“*I did not intend to convey in my conversation with The Washington Times reporter that there is anything unlawful about Elton John performing in a concert to raise money for a US presidential candidate. The Advisory Opinion 2004-26 is clear in the circumstances of the request that foreign nationals may volunteer and may even solicit contributions from non-foreign nationals, provided that they are not soliciting other foreign nationals*”), the *Times* declined to publish the clarification, resulting in a misleading public record. The Committee made public the clarification on the same day as the original erroneous column appeared, but Complainant relies on this misleading and incomplete column, without acknowledging the correction.³

³ As indicated earlier, it is evident that Complainant was fully aware of – but chose to disregard – this statement, as it is included in the material attached by Complainant to the complaint.

20044230332

More egregious however, is that Complainant ignores an earlier statement by Biersack – that appeared in a different newspaper, *The Washington Post* – that was truly dispositive of legal issues in this matter, rendering the complaint meritless, yet attaches the very article as an exhibit to its complaint

Musicians are permitted to donate their time and talents to assist candidates, even when the performers hail from foreign soil, said Bob Biersack, an FEC spokesman

"If you volunteer your services, then under the regulations that's not a contribution," Biersack said⁴

To attach this article with this Biersack quote to the complaint and then to selectively ignore it in favor of a misleading and later corrected quote, bolsters quite clearly the disingenuous motives behind this complaint – to embarrass the Committee with discredited allegations. The Commission should see this for what it is and dismiss this frivolous complaint forthwith.

C. By performing at a concert – for which the Committee paid all expenses – Elton John's activities fall squarely within the volunteer exemption, and no violation has occurred.

Even if the Commission were to determine that the complaint herein was validly filed, it is clear that in the instant case, Elton John freely volunteered his uncompensated personal services to the Committee, and his activities fit squarely into the permissible activities approved by the Commission in AOs 1987-25, 2004-26, and 2007-22. His volunteer services constituted the performance of a concert at a Committee fundraising event. He provided no tangible goods to the Committee.

In addition, as demonstrated in the Committee's response in MUR 5987, the Committee paid a significant sum – nearly \$325,000 – for the costs of the event in question, including costs related to Elton John's participation. More precisely, the Committee paid for the email sent over Elton John's signature, which is the only expense cited by Complainant as a potential in-kind contribution. Thus, to the best of the Committee's knowledge, the Committee did not receive "anything of value" that would constitute a contribution under the definition of 2 U S C §431(8)(A)(i), but, in fact, received only volunteer services exempt under 2 U S C §431(8)(B)(i). The simple fact that Elton John, a British national, volunteered to play a concert at a Committee event, and sent out an email permissible under AO 2004-26, does not give rise to any violation of law. Accordingly, the Commission should find no reason to believe that any of the Respondents violated any provision of the Act or Commission regulations and close this matter forthwith.

⁴ "Elton John to Croon for Clinton," *The Washington Post*, March 17, 2008 (http://blog.washingtonpost.com/the-trail/2008/03/17/elton_john_to_croon_for_clinto_1.html)

III. Conclusion

In conclusion, similar to MUR 5987, the complaint in this matter is wholly without merit, and disregards the statute, Commission regulations and Commission advisories under which the activity in question, i.e., a volunteer's concert and an email announcing such a concert, would be considered clearly permissible. The law, including the Act, Commission regulations and AOs, clearly exempts the value of volunteer services by anyone, including a foreign national, from the definition of contribution and permits a foreign national to solicit support as part of those volunteer services. For that reason, the Respondents respectfully request that the Commission find no reason to believe that the Respondents violated any provisions of the Act or Commission regulations and close this matter as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Lyn Utrecht
Lyn Utrecht

Eric Kleinfeld
Eric Kleinfeld

Exhibits

EXHIBIT A
MUR 5995

29044230334

RYAN, PHILLIPS, UTRECHT & MACKINNON *

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

* Nonlawyer Partner

1133 Connecticut Avenue, N W

Suite 300

Washington, D C 20036

(202) 293-1177

Facsimile (202) 293-3411

May 16, 2008

Thomasena P Duncan
General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20463

Re MUR 5987, Senator Hillary Clinton, Hillary Clinton for President and Shelly Moskwa, as Treasurer

Dear Ms Duncan

This is the response of our clients, Senator Hillary Clinton, Hillary Clinton for President and Shelly Moskwa, as Treasurer (collectively, the "Committee" or "Respondents") to the complaint filed in Matter Under Review ("MUR") 5987. In short, the complaint, relying on a misrepresentation of statements by the Commission's own spokesperson, is directly contrary to years of clear Commission precedent and wholly fails to recite any facts that would constitute a violation of the law. For the reasons stated below, Respondents respectfully request that the Commission find no reason to believe that any violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (the "Act"), as amended, or the Commission regulations has occurred, dismiss this complaint, and close this MUR as expeditiously as possible.

I. Background

At issue in this MUR, is a fundraising event organized by the Committee. The entertainment at the fundraiser consisted of a concert performed by renowned musician Elton John. The fundraiser was held on April 9, 2008 at Radio City Music Hall in New York, New York. The program consisted of remarks by Committee representatives and the candidate followed by the concert.

The Committee organized and handled this event similarly to other fundraisers that it organizes. Invitations to the event were distributed by the Committee prior to the event. Contributions were collected by the Committee prior to the event. In addition, because this event was a "ticketed" event, the Committee contracted with Ticketmaster to assist in the collection of

RECEIVED
FEC MAIL CENTER
MAY 16 AM 10 58

20044230335

certain contributions and the distribution of tickets. The Committee also contracted with the venue, Radio City Music Hall, for the production of the event, through which the Committee paid for the production and related expenses. Finally, the Committee also separately paid for the expenses of the performer, Elton John.

Elton John's participation, however, was questioned in a column in the *Washington Times*, which wrongfully relied on an outdated Commission Advisory Opinion ("AO") and completely misrepresented a statement by the Commission's own spokesperson, Bob Biersack, as well as his subsequent clarification regarding this event. Although clarified by Biersack ("*I did not intend to convey in my conversation with the Washington Times reporter that there is anything unlawful about Elton John performing in a concert to raise money for a U S presidential candidate. The Advisory Opinion 2004-26 is clear in the circumstances of the request that foreign nationals may volunteer and may even solicit contributions from non-foreign nationals, provided that they are not soliciting other foreign nationals*"), the *Times* declined to publish the clarification, resulting in a misleading public record. The Committee made public the above-referenced clarification on the same day as the original erroneous column appeared, but Complainant relied on this misleading and incomplete column, without acknowledging the correction and filed the meritless complaint in this matter.¹

II. Discussion

A. The law, including the Act, Commission regulations and AOs, clearly exempts the value of volunteer services by anyone, including a foreign national, from the definition of contribution.

The Act defines the term "foreign national" as an individual who is not a citizen of the United States and who is not lawfully admitted for permanent residence. 2 U S C §441e(b)(2). The Act prohibits a foreign national from making any contribution of money or other thing of value either directly or through any other person in connection with any Federal, State or local election. 2 U S C §441e(a)(1)(A). However, the Act and Commission regulations also provide that "[t]he term 'contribution' does not include the value of services provided without compensation by *any individual* who volunteers on behalf of a candidate or political committee." 2 U S C §431(8)(B)(i). See also 11 CFR 100.74 (emphasis added). As explained below, the term "any individual" has been interpreted by the Commission to include foreign nationals.

In a series of AOs dating back some twenty years and including one as recently as last December, the Commission has addressed the issue of whether uncompensated volunteer services provided by a foreign national constitute a prohibited contribution. In 1987-25, the Commission concluded that a foreign student's work for a campaign without compensation would not result in a contribution, because the value of uncompensated volunteer service is

¹ Complainant was fully aware of – but chose to disregard – this clarifying statement, as it is included in the material attached by Complainant to the complaint. A copy of the Biersack statement is attached hereto as *Exhibit A*. Complainant also disregarded an earlier statement by Biersack that appeared in *The Washington Post* that correctly set out the legal standard. See Section II B below.

specifically exempt from the Act's definition of contribution See AO 1987-25 at 1 Similarly, in 2004-26, the Commission concluded that a foreign national spouse of a candidate could participate in and perform campaign-related activities, including *by speaking at campaign events or by soliciting funds and support for the campaign*, because such uncompensated activities constituted exempt volunteer activity See AO 2004-26 at 2

As recently as December 2007, in AO 2007-22, the Commission reaffirmed these rulings, concluding that the performance of campaign-related activities by Canadian citizens, such as lit drops, door-to-door canvassing, telephone banking and get-out-the-vote activities, without compensation, constitutes volunteer activity, and, as such, is exempt from the Act's coverage See AO 2007-22 at 3 In this AO, the Commission also explains and distinguishes the sole AO cited by Complainant, 1981-51, when considering the acceptance of goods – in the form of printed election materials – from foreign citizens Unlike volunteer services, the provision of goods, whether it be a work of art as in 1981-51, or flyers, door hangers or signs as in 2007-22, does constitute a prohibited in-kind contribution, due to the receipt of tangible items not covered by the plain language of the volunteer exemption *Id* at 6² Services which do not produce tangible goods – even where, as here, provided by a foreign national – are covered by the plain meaning of the volunteer exemption Thus, the relevant law clearly compels dismissal of the complaint

B. Complainant misstates the law, disregards Commission precedent and misquotes the Commission's own spokesperson

Complainant completely misstates the law, citing only a single Advisory Opinion, 1981-51, which itself, as indicated above, has been distinguished by the Commission The Complainant simply fails to cite the other pertinent AOs and dismisses other Commission rulings as applying only to "routine campaign activities, such as stuffing envelopes"³ Clearly, no such limitation has ever been placed by the Commission on the volunteer exemption In fact, to the contrary, the Commission has recognized that the volunteer exemption applies to a wide range of participation, including speaking at campaign events and soliciting campaign contributions Complainant's failure to recognize these other AOs and its dismissal of the Commission's findings is disingenuous and serves no purpose other than to further the filing of a distorted and misleading complaint The Commission should recognize this as such

Complainant also relies on a misleading newspaper column that included a misquote of the Commission's own spokesperson As originally appearing in the *Washington Times*, the column seemingly raised questions about the legality of Elton John volunteering his services by means of a concert and seemed to bolster that question with a quote from Bob Biersack Although clarified by Biersack ("*I did not intend to convey in my conversation with The Washington Times reporter that there is anything unlawful about Elton John performing in a*

² Thus, while the Commission has declined to explicitly overrule 1981-51, it has clearly distinguished the circumstances where the provision of volunteer services does not result in the provision of tangible goods to a candidate

³ The material attached by Complainant to the complaint cites to AO 2004-26 even though reference to it was omitted from the complaint itself, and given that that AO sanctioned solicitations by foreign nationals, Complainant's own characterization is blatantly misleading

concert to raise money for a US presidential candidate. The Advisory Opinion 2004-26 is clear in the circumstances of the request that foreign nationals may volunteer and may even solicit contributions from non-foreign nationals, provided that they are not soliciting other foreign nationals"). The Times declined to publish the clarification, resulting in a misleading public record. The Committee made public the clarification on the same day as the original erroneous column appeared, but Complainant relies on this misleading and incomplete column, without acknowledging the correction.⁴

In addition, Complainant ignores an earlier statement by Biersack – that appeared in a different newspaper, *The Washington Post* – that was truly dispositive of legal issues in this matter, rendering the complaint meritless.

Musicians are permitted to donate their time and talents to assist candidates, even when the performers hail from foreign soil, said Bob Biersack, an FEC spokesman.

"If you volunteer your services, then under the regulations that's not a contribution," Biersack said.⁵

Commission regulations at 11 CFR 111.4(d)(3) require that all complaints – in order to be valid – "contain a clear and concise recitation of the facts which describe a violation of a statute or regulation over which the Commission has jurisdiction" (emphasis added). Complainant fails to meet this standard, and hence, the complaint should be dismissed forthwith. Complainant cites a single incomplete and misleading newspaper column and disregards the Commission's own clarification of the law. Complainant cites only a single fact in its complaint, i.e., that the "British singer Elton John, a foreign national [will] perform a musical concert on April 9, 2008, at New York City's Radio City Music Hall." Given the clear language of the volunteer exemption, as described above, that fact alone does not describe a violation of either the Act or the Commission's regulations. When coupled with Complainant's blatant omission of the only relevant AOs, it is indisputable that Complainant has failed to describe a violation of law. Thus, the complaint is invalid, for failing to meet the Commission's 111.4 requirements, and for this reason alone, the complaint should be dismissed.

C. By performing at a concert – for which the Committee paid all expenses – Elton John's activities fall squarely within the volunteer exemption, and no violation has occurred.

Even if the Commission were to determine that the complaint herein was validly filed, it is clear that in the instant case Elton John freely volunteered his uncompensated personal services to the Committee, and his activities fit squarely into the permissible activities approved by the Commission in AOs 1987-25, 2004-26, and 2007-22. His volunteer services constituted the performance of a concert at a Committee fundraising event. He provided no tangible goods

⁴ As indicated earlier, it is evident that Complainant was fully aware of – but chose to disregard – this statement, as it is included in the material attached by Complainant to the complaint.

⁵ "Elton John to Croon for Clinton," *The Washington Post*, March 17, 2008 (http://blog.washingtonpost.com/the-trail/2008/03/17/elton_john_to_croon_for_clinto_1.html).

to the Committee His performance is clearly more akin to the volunteer services approved by the Committee in AOs 1987-25, 2004-26, and 2007-22, rather than the original work of art provided in the 1981 AO cited by complainant

In addition, Elton John did not pay for any expenses in connection with his volunteer services To the contrary, the Committee paid the expenses for both Elton John and the event itself The Committee received a bill in advance of the event for expenses for Elton John, and the Committee promptly paid for those expenses, also in advance of the event In addition, the Committee was billed in advance of the event for the production and event expenses by the venue, Radio City Music Hall, as well as other vendors, and, as with the expenses for Elton John, promptly paid for those expenses, also in advance of the event The Committee paid in excess of \$278,329 for the costs of the event, which, to the best of the Committee's knowledge is a far higher amount than the Committee paid for any other fundraising event held during the campaign⁶ These expenses, which are itemized in detail and attached as *Exhibit B* hereto, included expenses for Elton John,⁷ event site rental and other production and staging costs, such as sound and lighting, equipment rental, including the transport of instruments, printing, security, catering, insurance, building services, licensing fees, and a five percent (5%) contingency for other expenses⁸

The Committee has also attached copies of the pertinent payment checks to this response as part of *Exhibit B* All of these payments have appeared or will appear on the Committee's applicable monthly FEC report for the month when the payments were made

Thus, to the best of the Committee's knowledge, Elton John did not pay for any expenses related to his performance The Committee did not receive "anything of value" that would constitute a contribution under the definition of 2 U S C §431(8)(A)(i), but, in fact, received only volunteer services exempt under 2 U S C §431(8)(B)(i) The simple fact that Elton John, a British national, volunteered to play a concert at a Committee event, does not give rise to any violation of law Accordingly, the Commission should find no reason to believe that any of the Respondents violated any provision of the Act or Commission regulations and close this matter forthwith

⁶ This amount excludes the fee of \$46,389 paid to Ticketmaster for their services in ticket distribution and brings the total for the event to \$324,718 Committee fundraisers with a venue rental typically cost no more than \$15,000, and even the Committee's large scale public events run approximately \$50,000 in cost

⁷ Elton John's expenses were paid directly to his wholly-owned domestic corporation, J Bondi, Inc, which the Committee understands was organized to receive income in the U S from his concert and other appearances and other U S income producing endeavors

⁸ See also, *Exhibit C*, Affidavit of Shelly Moskwa, Treasurer

III. Conclusion

In conclusion, the complaint in this matter is wholly without merit, relying on an incomplete reference to Commission AOs, while disregarding the statute, Commission regulations and Commission advisories under which the activity in question would be considered clearly permissible. The Committee received volunteer services from Elton John and nothing more. For that reason, the Respondents respectfully request that the Commission find no reason to believe that the Respondents violated any provisions of the Act or Commission regulations and close this matter as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Lyn Utrecht
Lyn Utrecht

Eric Kleinfeld
Eric Kleinfeld

Exhibits

29044230341

EXHIBIT A
MUR 5987

THE FACT HUB | The Straight Scoop On Election '08 From The Hillary Clinton Campaign

FEC Spokesman Confirms There Was Nothing Unlawful About Elton John Performance

427/2008 11 41 45 AM

Revised new report, maliciously support Hanoi, breaks the law by allowing Guan Yin a foreign national to perform the
for Japanese

History's campaign has complied with the law. Since 1987 the FEC has consistently held that foreign interests may contribute their own money to campaigns on an unreciprocated basis. When given a simple volunteering to campaign would now be subject to the controls. The government's new rules will meet FEC rules.

FBI Director Felt Spillmore Confirmed That There Was Nothing Unusual About The 1968 John Performance

I did not intend to convey in my conversation with the Washington Times reporter that there is anything unethical about their performance; in a comment to the reporter for a US presidential candidate, The Advisory Council 2004 at 11:40 on 11/10/2004 of the report the American Institute for Veterans and Military Families said: "The report is a good example of the kind of work that we can expect to see from the VA in the future."



LATEST FACTS

ABC News Military Leads In Total Powder Vote

Fast Check: Bill Clinton Did Not Predict Hillary Would Win 60% Of The Vote In West Virginia


Answer: Clinton's Higher Option: More Of A Conservative Winner?

Post Check: Military and OPIC

Fast Check: History Did Not Say Money Grubbers

Abstract

VIDEO FACTS



WSP 15 million people uninsured

Restoring America's Standing in the World

A Champion for Women

Comprehensive Government Reform

Strengthening Our Democracy

Reforming Our Immigration System

An Innovation Agenda

Creating Opportunity for Rural America

Read the full Hillary Clinton for President

Contact Us | Privacy Policy

Hillary Clinton for President is not a partner for the content of any external website

29044230343